EXHIBIT 35

```
1
       IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
        FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
3
                EASTERN DIVISION
4
5
                            : HON. DAN A.
     IN RE: NATIONAL
6
     PRESCRIPTION OPIATE : POLSTER
     LITIGATION
7
     APPLIES TO ALL CASES : NO.
8
                             : 1:17-MD-2804
9
            - HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL -
10
    SUBJECT TO FURTHER CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW
11
                    VOLUME I
12
13
                 April 17, 2019
14
15
16
                 Videotaped deposition of
    THOMAS PREVOZNIK, taken pursuant to
    notice, was held at the law offices of
17
    Williams & Connolly, 725 12th Street,
18
    Washington, D.C., beginning at 9:11 a.m.,
    on the above date, before Michelle L.
19
    Gray, a Registered Professional Reporter,
    Certified Shorthand Reporter, Certified
20
    Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public.
21
22
           GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES
       877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
23
                 deps@golkow.com
24
```

- Q. But neither the statute nor
- the regulation says explicitly that
- manufacturers need to know their
- 4 customers' customers, do they?
- A. It does not say that
- 6 explicitly. But it does say that you
- ⁷ need to quard against diversion.
- Q. Has the DEA ever provided
- ⁹ guidance to the industry in writing
- informing registrants that they are to
- 11 know their customers' customers?
- 12 A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Has DEA provided any other
- 14 kind of guidance, besides written
- ¹⁵ guidance, informing manufacturers of any
- duty to know their customers' customers?
- 17 A. Well, again it comes down to
- what information you have. So if you
- 19 have that information, you have the duty
- to protect and guard against the
- ²¹ diversion.
- So if you have that
- information, you're to guard against
- diversion of controlled substances.

- Q. But to my question, has the
- ² DEA ever provided any kind of guidance to
- manufacturers informing them that they
- 4 were to know their customers' customer?
- A. No, not to my knowledge.
- 6 Q. Okay. Let's talk for a
- ⁷ minute about ARCOS.
- 8 Generally speaking, what
- 9 sorts of information does ARCOS contain?
- 10 A. ARCOS contains the
- 11 manufacturers and distributors that are
- 12 to report all transactions for
- 13 Schedule I, Schedule II, Schedule III
- 14 narcotics, and GHB, and manufacturers
- 15 also have reported -- additional
- 16 reporting requirements for some
- psychotropics.
- Q. Okay. Would ARCOS contain
- 19 all of the distributions of prescription
- opioids by manufacturers to distributors?
- A. So the transactions for
- manufacture -- yes, manufacturer to a
- distributor? Yes.
- Q. Would ARCOS contain all the

- distributions of prescription opioids
- ² from distributors to pharmacies or other
- ³ retail outlets?
- A. For those items, yes.
- ⁵ Q. Does ARCOS data provide any
- 6 details about those transactions, like
- ⁷ the amount, the recipients --
- A. Yes, it tracks the quantity.
- 9 It has the DEA number of the registrant
- that -- whether it's a sale. It could be
- 11 a sale, it could be a purchase. It could
- be a disposition of, you know, getting
- wasted. Any transaction that -- that
- 14 could fall within the system that --
- that's trackable, that would be in there,
- 16 for those items.
- Q. Okay. Through ARCOS, can
- DEA see the type of medication that's
- 19 being purchased?
- A. Well, it's in there by NDC
- 21 number.
- Q. Okay. And the NDC number
- would -- would allow the DEA to determine
- which product we are talking about?

- 1 BY MR. O'CONNOR:
- O. Yeah.
- A. It says, "Ms. Duft explained
- 4 the cash-back system which allows
- 5 Mallinckrodt to view who their customers
- 6 are selling to and to what products they
- ⁷ are selling. Ms. Duft stated
- 8 Mallinckrodt has been reviewing this
- 9 system since last fall, though it's been
- 10 available to them for several years." So
- they've had -- they've had the data for a
- 12 few years.
- Q. At any point before that
- 14 time, had anyone at DEA ever told a
- 15 manufacturer that it should review
- 16 chargeback data?
- MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection
- to the scope.
- 19 Industrywide guidance was
- the authorization, but you can
- answer if you know.
- THE WITNESS: I don't know.
- 23 BY MR. O'CONNOR:
- Q. Just to be clear, at any

- point before that time, had the DEA ever
- ² issued any industrywide quidance
- ³ indicating that manufacturers should
- 4 review chargeback data?
- A. Not to my knowledge.
- 6 Q. Earlier you mentioned
- ⁷ something about prescription data.
- 8 Chargeback data doesn't involve
- 9 prescription data, does it?
- 10 A. It depends what data -- for
- 11 SearchPoint and ChoicePoint data that the
- 12 pharmacies were selling to it.
- 13 Q. But SearchPoint data was not
- 14 chargeback data, correct?
- MR. FINKELSTEIN: Scope.
- THE WITNESS: It was an
- exchange of money for their data,
- ¹⁸ so...
- 19 BY MR. O'CONNOR:
- Q. Is DEA aware of whether
- 21 chargeback data provides information on
- every sale of the Schedule I and II
- ²³ opioids?
- MS. SINGER: Objection.

```
1
           Scope.
2
                  MR. FINKELSTEIN:
                                     Scope.
3
                  THE WITNESS: Schedule I?
4
    BY MR. O'CONNOR:
5
                  Schedule II and III.
           O.
6
                  I -- could you repeat the
           Α.
7
    question?
8
           0.
                  Yeah. Sure. I'm sorry, I
    did say Schedule I. Strike that.
9
                                         I'11
10
    ask a new question.
11
                  Is the DEA aware whether
12
    chargeback data provides information on
13
    every sale of Schedule II and
14
    Schedule III opioids?
15
                  I don't know that.
           Α.
16
           Ο.
                  Is DEA aware whether
17
    chargeback data provides information
18
    regarding every sale?
19
                  MR. FINKELSTEIN:
                                             Ιf
                                     Scope.
20
           we don't get to something that's
21
           within his authorization pretty
22
           quick, I'm going to start
23
           instructing him not to answer.
24
                  But you can answer that
```

- me that the way -- the way the program
- ² functioned, is more important than what's
- described on paper?
- MR. FINKELSTEIN: Vaque.
- THE WITNESS: I don't know.
- You'd have to assess both to see.
- I mean, you would hope that it
- would function better, yes.
- 9 BY MR. O'CONNOR:
- 0. Because what matters is
- whether the program identifies suspicious
- orders when they come in, correct?
- MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.
- Vaque.
- THE WITNESS: What matters
- is, do you have an effective means
- to safeguard against diversion.
- That's what matters, because we're
- trying to protect the public.
- 20 BY MR. O'CONNOR:
- Q. Does it say anywhere in the
- relevant regulations that registrants are
- required to have a written policy with
- respect to suspicious order monitoring?

```
1
           Α.
                  No.
2
                  Okay. You spent some time
           Ο.
3
    in the liaison policy -- or the policy
    liaison section, correct?
4
5
           Α.
                  Correct.
6
                  And could you describe for
           Ο.
7
    me the modes of communication that that
8
    office or other offices used to
9
    communicate guidance to the registrant
10
    community?
11
                  MR. FINKELSTEIN: Objection.
12
           Vague.
13
                  THE WITNESS: The -- it's
14
           basically two sections, or units.
15
           One is policy and the other one is
16
           liaison. I was in the liaison
17
           section. So that would be the
18
           interact -- pretty much the
19
           physical interaction with people,
20
           whether it's registrants or
21
           associations, that type, you know,
22
           where we're physically meeting
23
           with them or physically doing
24
           conferences, doing presentations,
```